

stop refusing to provide hardworking families like the Ramirezes with any tax relief whatsoever.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to instruct conferees on the child tax credit. Let us for once show families like the Ramirezes that they matter to this country just as much as the millionaire families do.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I would say to the gentleman from California who just spoke is a couple of points. The child credit actually, we phase out for upper-income individuals.

□ 0230

In fact, families that have children that are above a certain income threshold do not qualify. Their children do not qualify. I think what is interesting in all of this debate is night after night when we debate this motion to instruct and we talk about trying to provide for the children that we are only talking about some of the children; that is, children of the successful families do not qualify. But that is neither here nor there, but I wanted to set the record straight that as she talks about tax cuts for the wealthy regarding a child credit, those successful families do not qualify for the child credit.

What I would say to the gentleman, too, who just spoke regarding the Ramirez family and the teacher and mechanic with children, under existing law, and again this is sort of back of the envelope calculations, but under existing law, as I understand it, the Ramirez family already is entitled to the refundable child credit; in fact, a family with children whose annual income from salaries and wages is roughly \$25,000. Their Federal income tax liability before the child credit is roughly \$885. Their tax liability after the child credit is zero. In fact, with the refundable child credit, they get an additional \$565, and part of that of course is refundable. The total check from the United States Treasury to the family like the Ramirez family is roughly, again back of the envelope calculation, \$2,282. That is an income supplement that goes to good hard-working families like the Ramirez family as described by the previous speaker. So I think that they are already benefiting from actions of Congress, specifically the refundable child credit from 2001.

Again, I would just sum up, Mr. Speaker, and say that the Democratic motion to instruct actually allows the child credit to drop from \$1,000 to \$700 after the 2004 election. As a result, millions of low- and middle-income families will get under their motion a smaller child credit. The House-passed bill H.R. 1308 ensures that the child credit remains at this \$1,000 level that we have decided to be appropriate throughout the decade. Again good policy now, good policy next year, good policy 5 or 7 or 8 years down the road. The Democratic motion to instruct should fail because it does not elimi-

nate the marriage penalty in the child credit until the year 2010 and even then just for a year. So again under their motion millions of children will be denied the child credit because their parents are married. What signal are we sending across the country that we say that again if they do the right thing, work hard, play by the rules, and then choose to raise their family within the institution of marriage but it is going to cost them on their bottom line under the Democratic motion that they do not get this refundability if, in fact, they choose marriage as the course for their family?

The House-passed bill benefits middle-income families, married families, by eliminating the child credit immediately for married couples.

I did want to point out because I know it has been referenced on a couple of occasions the House-passed bill does not deny child credit to military families. Military families, including those that are deployed abroad, are already receiving a refundable credit and will continue to receive a refundable credit under the House-passed bill.

So I think, again, H.R. 1308, which has passed this House, is far superior than the Senate version. So I would urge a no vote on the motion to instruct. In Washington, DC, Mr. Speaker, pessimists are seldom prophets. I happen to believe in the best nature of this institution as well as our counterparts on the other side of the Capitol. I happen to believe that we will be able to find a good workable compromise for all children of working families. So I would urge a no vote on the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The hour is late; so let me say two quick points. One, as a clarification, the House-passed bill does, in fact, deny the child tax credit to military families in combat zones. And, secondly, let me say that if the majority party were as serious about providing this credit to these needy families as they profess to be, then we would be passing the Senate bill now. We can get this done before we go home on Friday or Saturday or whenever it is we are going to go home. It has already passed the Senate 94 to two. It is fair. It provides an immediate benefit, and it does not worsen an already staggering deficit situation for this country that imperils our ability to provide the kinds of services that our people in this country need and deserve out into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 0245

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2765, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-230) on the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2765) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2427, PHARMACEUTICAL MARKET ACCESS ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-231) on the resolution (H. Res. 335) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2427) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the reimportation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2210, SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-232) on the resolution (H. Res. 336) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2210) to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO JOE D. GUNN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute of Joe D. Gunn, the President of the AFL-CIO in Texas. I offer praise and thanks to him for his more than 40 years of service as a labor leader.